REMARKS

Claims 1-10 of the present application have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shih '136 in view of Ozeki, et al '523. Responsive to the rejection, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 4 to clarify the metes and bounds of the present invention. It is believed that the present invention is not rendered unpatentable by the references of record.

Shih '136 discloses an auxiliary safety lift device for an elevator which, however, is located at and associated with the main elevator drive. In particular, as depicted in Fig. 2, the auxiliary lift device includes a secondary motor 60 and an electromagnetic clutch 40, directly adjacent the main motor 21. The main shaft 210 of main motor 21 may be driven by the secondary motor 60 through clutch 40 when power to the main system is cut off. See Shih, column 3, lines 13-20. The main shaft 210 is coupled to the drive pulley of the drive unit (not numbered but connected to cable 63) through main speed reducer 23. Thus, in all situations, the drive pulley is driven by a motor force applied to it through the speed reducer.

The present invention, on the other hand, claims a method and apparatus for evacuation of lift passengers utilizing an auxiliary system by which an additional force is produced at a location remote from the drive unit and which does not emanate from a drive pulley of the drive unit. Thus, it is to be contrasted to the teachings of Shih '136 which provides an auxiliary force through the secondary motor and clutch provided as part of the drive system and whereby the force remains transmitted by the main drive pulley. There is neither teaching nor suggestion in Shih '136 that the source of the auxiliary force can be provided at a location remote from the drive unit or that it not emanate from a drive pulley of the drive.

The Examiner contends that Ozeki, et al '523 teaches a counterweight elevator system, whose teachings may be combined with those of Shih '136 to render the present invention

obvious. While Shih '136 does not explicitly disclose a counterweight drive and Ozeki, et al '523 does, Ozeki, et al does not cure the basic deficiency of Shih '136 by its lack of teaching or suggestion that an additional force can be produced at a location remote from the drive unit and not from a drive pulley of the drive. Ozeki, et al '523 merely indicates that an auxiliary control may be located in a door pocket, without providing any reference whatsoever of the nature of the drive unit with which it is to be utilized, other than indicating that it is of a conventional nature. There is certainly no disclosure of an auxiliary force-generating means, remote from the main drive and drive pulley, and thus the combination of Shih '136 and Ozeki, et al '523 also does not teach or suggest the production of an additional force at a location remote from the drive unit and which does not emanate from a drive pulley as required by and set forth in the claims of the present application.

Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection of claims 1-10 be withdrawn and the present application pass to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEITZER CORNMAN GROSS AND BONDELL LLP
Attorneys For Applicant
292 Madison Avenue, 19th Floor
New York, NY 10017
(646)424-0770

BY _____
JAY A. BONDELL, ESQ., REG. #28,188

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, April 5, 2004.

Carol L. Wood, Sender: _____